

CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 27 2007

App. Serial No. 10/566,514  
Docket No. US030253 US2

### Remarks

Claims 3-6, 8-11, 15-16 and 18-21 are currently pending in the patent application. Applicant has amended claims 3, 8 and 18 in a manner believed to be consistent with the suggestions of the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests that each of the amendments be entered in view of M.P.E.P. § 714.12, which states that "Any amendment that will place the application either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered." Applicant believes that the amendments place the application in condition for allowance or in the alternative in better form for any appeal. For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is allowable over the cited references.

In the instant final Office Action dated June 19, 2007 claims 18-21 stand rejected under U.S.C § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement; claims 18-21 stand rejected under U.S.C § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention; claims 1, 2, 8-11 and 15-16 stand rejected under U.S.C § 102(b) over Broxterman *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,058,467). Claims 3-6 and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

In view of the potential allowability of claims 3-6 and 14, Applicant has amended claim 3 to be in independent form, incorporating limitations of claims 1 and 2. Applicant has also amended claim 8 to incorporate limitations of claim 14 (claims 9-11 and 15-16 depend from claim 8). Applicant submits that, as is consistent with the instant Office Action (*see, e.g.*, Allowable Subject Matter beginning on page 8), claims 3-6, 8-11 and 15-16 are in condition for allowance.

The only remaining rejections are the Section 112(2) rejections. Applicant respectfully traverses the Section 112(2) rejection of claim 18. The alleged lack of support in the Specification for claim limitations directed to a fourth multiplexer is flawed, because Applicant's Specification provides explicit support for a fourth multiplexer. For example, Applicant's Figure 1 shows an input MUX block 400, an output MUX block 500, a pointer MUX block 300 and a source select block 600 (*i.e.*, four multiplexers), which are discussed in Applicant's Specification in greater detail in

App. Serial No. 10/566,514  
Docket No. US030253 US2

relation to Figures 4, 5, 3 and 6 respectively. Notwithstanding, Applicant has attempted to address the Section 112(2) claim by an amendment that addresses the aspects believed to be the basis for the Examiner's rejection. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection has been overcome.


Regarding the Section 112(2) rejection of claim 18 based on the alleged lack of antecedent basis for the claim limitation "the plurality of pointer registers" in line 11, Applicant submits that one of skill in the art would understand the scope of the claims. Notwithstanding, Applicant has amended claim 18 to clarify that "the plurality of pointer registers" in line 11 refers to the second plurality of pointer registers. Therefore, Applicant requests that this Section 112(2) rejection of claim 18 be withdrawn.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, Peter Zawilski, at (408) 474-9063.

*Please direct all correspondence to:*

Corporate Patent Counsel  
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards  
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41  
San Jose, CA 95131

CUSTOMER NO. 65913

By:   
Name: Robert J. Crawford  
Reg. No.: 32,122  
(NXPS.223PA)